

RCE *HW*

PTO/SB/30 (08-03)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

Request For Continued Examination (RCE) Transmittal

Address to:
Mail Stop RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Application Number	10/072,176
Filing Date	February 7, 2002
First Named Inventor	Finn, et al.
Art Unit	2837
Examiner Name	Fletcher, Marlon T.
Attorney Docket Number	5538/2012

This is a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 of the above-identified application.
Request for Continued Examination (RCE) practice under 37 CFR 1.114 does not apply to any utility or plant application filed prior to June 8, 1995, or to any design application. See Instruction Sheet for RCEs (not to be submitted to the USPTO) on page 2.

1. **Submission required under 37 CFR 1.114** Note: If the RCE is proper, any previously filed unentered amendments and amendments enclosed with the RCE will be entered in the order in which they were filed unless applicant instructs otherwise. If applicant does not wish to have any previously filed unentered amendment(s) entered, applicant must request non-entry of such amendment(s).

a. ☒ Previously submitted. If a final Office action is outstanding, any amendments filed after the final Office action may be considered as a submission even if this box is not checked.

i. ☐ Consider the arguments in the Appeal Brief or Rely Brief previously filed on _____

ii. ☒ Other Response to Final Office Action filed on 11/16/04

b. ☐ Enclosed

i. ☐ Amendment/Reply

iii. ☐ Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

ii. ☐ Affidavit(s)/ Declaration(s)

iv. ☐ Other _____

2. Miscellaneous

a. ☐ Suspension of action on the above-identified application is requested under 37 CFR 1.103(c) for a period of _____ months. (Period of suspension shall not exceed 3 months; Fee under 37 CFR 1.17(i) required)

b. ☐ Other _____

3. Fees

The RCE fee under 37 CFR 1.17(e) is required by 37 CFR 1.114 when the RCE is filed.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge the following fees, or credit any overpayments, to

a. ☒ Deposit Account No. 16-0085; Reference No. 5538/2012

i. ☒ RCE fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(e)

ii. ☒ Extension of time fee (37 CFR 1.136 and 1.17)

iii. ☐ Other _____

b. ☐ Check in the amount of \$ _____ enclosed

c. ☐ Payment by credit card (Form PTO-2038 enclosed)

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT REQUIRED

Name (Print/Type)	Matthew Beaudet	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	50,649
Signature	<i>[Signature]</i>	Date	3/9/05

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Name (Print/Type) Nancy Arsenault

Signature *[Signature]*


Date 3/9/05

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.114. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

03/15/2005 CCHAU1 00000034 160085 10072176

01 FC:1801 790.00 DA



Atty. Docket No.: 5538/2017

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Finn, et al.
Serial No.: 10/072,176
Filed: February 7, 2002
Entitled: Music Database Searching

Examiner: Fletcher, M.

Group Art Unit: 2837

Conf. No.: 1323

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.10

I hereby certify that the paper (and any paper or fee referred to as being enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service using Express Mail to Addressee Service, under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.10, **Express Mail Label No. EV242760095US** on this date, **November 16, 2004**, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Kathleen M. Williams

Name of Person Mailing Paper

Signature of Person Mailing Paper

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL REJECTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Sir:

This Amendment After Final Rejection is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on June 16, 2004, in the above-identified application.

An extension of time and a Notice of Appeal from the Final Office Action dated June 16, 2004, with appropriate fees, are being filed concurrently.

Amendments to the Claims are shown in the "Listing of the Claims" which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 9 of this paper.

Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments and remarks.

The following Listing of the Claims will replace all prior versions and all prior listings of the claims in the present application:

Listing of The Claims:

[List all of the claims ever filed in the application, with their status in parentheses, e.g.:]

1. (Currently Amended) An apparatus for searching a database of music files, comprising:

input means to provide search criteria comprising a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals, wherein said input means includes quantization means to determine a closest chromatic interval, a closest whole tone interval, or a closest minor or major third interval between two successive musical pitches in the sequence of melodic intervals;

comparing means, for comparing said sequence of melodic intervals with selected portions of a plurality of computer-readable music files; and

output means, to provide a list of possible matches of said search criteria with at least one of said plurality of computer-readable music files.

2. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 1 wherein said input means comprises a microphone into which a user can sing, hum or whistle said tune.

3. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 1 wherein said input means comprises a MIDI keyboard for playing the tune.

4. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 1, claim 2 or claim 3, wherein the input means further includes a pitch recognition means to identify each melodic interval between a succession of musical pitches input as said tune.

5. (Cancelled)

6. (Currently Amended) ~~The~~ An apparatus according to claim 1 for searching a database of music files, comprising:

input means to provide search criteria comprising a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals, wherein said input means further includes quantization means to determine a closest major, minor or other scale to which successive musical pitches of the sequence of melodic intervals will fit;

comparing means, for comparing said sequence of melodic intervals with selected portions of a plurality of computer-readable music files; and

output means, to provide a list of possible matches of said search criteria with at least one of said plurality of computer-readable music files.

7. (Currently Amended) The An apparatus according to claim 1 for searching a database of music files, comprising:

input means to provide search criteria comprising a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals;

comparing means, for comparing said sequence of melodic intervals with selected portions of a plurality of computer-readable music files;

output means, to provide a list of possible matches of said search criteria with at least one of said plurality of computer-readable music files;

~~further including~~ means to (a) determine, from said input sequence of melodic intervals, a succession of rhythmic intervals and b) use said succession of rhythmic intervals as further search criteria.

8. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 1 further including means to provide as input additional search criteria comprising text information.

9. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 1 wherein said comparing means includes means for comparing one or more segments of said tune with said selected portions of said plurality of computer-readable music files, and wherein said output means bases the

likelihood of a match on the number of separate segments and/or selected portions for which a possible match is indicated.

10. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 9 wherein said segments of the search tune and/or said selected portions of the music file are defined as overlapping note sequences.

11. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 1 wherein said comparing means includes:

means for representing a) the input sequence of melodic intervals, and b) the selected portions of said plurality of computer-readable music files, each as a function of pitch against time, and

means for measuring a closeness of fit of said representations a) the input sequence of melodic intervals and b) the selected portions of said plurality of computer-readable music files to determine a degree of matching of the input sequence to each one of the selected portions.

12. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 11 further including transformation means for applying at least one transformation function to at least one of a) the input sequence of melodic intervals and b) the selected portions of said plurality of computer-readable music files prior to measuring a closeness of fit.

13. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 12 wherein said at least one transformation function comprises any one of: a translation in pitch; a translation in time; a scaling in time; a variable scaling in time over different parts of the graph; a variable pitch translation over different parts of the graph; and a transformation by removal of selected sections from the graph.

14. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 11 wherein said means for measuring closeness of fit comprises means for determining an error score for an i -note input sequence compared against an n -note selected portion of said music file for each of a plurality of values of n .

15. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 14 further including means for determining a value of n for which the error score is minimized.

16. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 15 further including means for varying n about a start value until an error score minimum is attained.

17. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 1 wherein said comparing means includes to identify relevant selected portions of a plurality of computer-readable music files by applying selection criteria to identify portions of the files likely to contain tunes.

18. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 17 wherein said relevant selected portions of said music files are stored in an index.

19. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 18 wherein said relevant selected portions stored in said index are encoded as text, said input means further including means for encoding said sequence of melodic intervals as text string, and said comparing means comprising a text search engine.

20. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 17 wherein the location, in said computer-readable music files, of said relevant selected portions of said music files are indicated by one or more tags, and said comparing means are adapted to locate said tags.

21. (Currently Amended) An apparatus for indexing a music database comprising:

means for identifying relevant selected portions of a plurality of computer-readable music files by applying criteria to identify portions of the files likely to contain tunes, wherein said criteria comprises a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals, wherein said means for identifying includes quantization means to determine a closest chromatic interval, a closest whole tone interval, or a closest minor or major third interval between two successive musical pitches in the sequence of melodic intervals; and

means for tagging said music files to identify positions corresponding to said relevant selected portions.

22. (Currently Amended) An apparatus for indexing a music database comprising:

means for identifying relevant selected portions of a plurality of computer-readable music files by applying selection criteria to identify portions of the files likely to contain tunes, wherein said criteria comprises a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals, wherein said means for identifying includes quantization means to determine a closest chromatic interval, a closest whole tone interval, or a closest minor or major third interval between two successive musical pitches in the sequence of melodic intervals; and

means for generating an index of said music files containing information representative of said relevant selected portions.

23. (Previously Presented) A method for effecting a search through a database of music files, comprising:

providing as input, search criteria comprising a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals;

comparing said sequence of melodic intervals with selected portions of a plurality of computer-readable music files; and

providing as output, a list of possible matches of said search criteria with at least one of said plurality of computer-readable music files.

24. (Previously Presented) A computer program product, comprising a computer readable medium having thereon computer program code means adapted, such that when said program is loaded onto a computer, said program interacts with said computer:

providing as input, search criteria comprising a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals;

comparing said sequence of melodic intervals with selected portions of a plurality of computer-readable music files; and

providing as output, a list of possible matches of said search criteria with at least one of said plurality of computer-readable music files.

25. (Currently Amended) An apparatus for determining a sequence of melodic intervals from an input source comprising:

input means for providing an input signal waveform representing a tune, wherein said input means includes quantization means to determine a closest chromatic interval, a closest whole tone interval, or a closest minor or major third interval between two successive musical pitches in the sequence of melodic intervals;

note discretization means comprising means for dividing a frequency-time representation of said input signal waveform into discrete time periods to form a succession of input tune elements and, for each input tune element, determining a single gradient of the input over said time period.

26. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 25 further including:

means for designating the gradient of each element as one of the categories selected from the group consisting of: horizontal / near horizontal; diagonal; and vertical / non-vertical; and

means for coalescing adjacent elements of the same category to form compound elements.

27. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 26 further including means for eliminating said diagonal elements by redesignating each diagonal element or part of each diagonal element as a horizontal element having a value equal to a nearest adjacent horizontal element.

28. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 1 wherein said comparing means includes means for comparing a plurality of segments of said tune with a plurality of segments from said plurality of computer-readable music files, means for determining a number of matches of each segment-type, and wherein said output means bases the likelihood of a match on a comparison of the profile of the number of each segment-type for said tune and for said music files.

29. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 11 wherein the means for measuring a degree of matching includes means for determining a number of transformation functions required in order to match the representations a) and b).

30. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 1 wherein said computer-readable music files and/or said input search criteria comprise audio files.

31. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 30 wherein said comparing means further includes means to identify relevant selected portions of said audio files likely to contain tunes by detecting a component of the audio signal which is common to both left and right channels of a stereo pair of channels.

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are currently pending in the application. Claim 5 is canceled. Claims 1, 6, 7, 21, 22, and 25 are amended. The amendments to claims 1, 6, 7, 21, 22, and 25 have been made to incorporate the limitation of claim 5. The amendments find support in the specification and are discussed in the relevant sections below. No new matter is added.

Rejection of claims 1-4, 9-25, and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-4, 9-25, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for alleged anticipation by Ghias et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,686). The Examiner states that the Ghias et al. reference discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 and dependent claims 2-4, 9-20, 28-31, as well as claim 23 and dependent claim 24, all include the limitation of “search criteria comprising a tune as a **sequence of melodic intervals**” (emphasis added). Claim 25 recites “an apparatus for determining a **sequence of melodic intervals**” (emphasis added). Claims 21 and 22 as amended recite “an apparatus for indexing a music database” that includes the step of “applying criteria to identify portions of the files likely to contain tunes wherein said criteria comprise a tune as a **sequence of melodic intervals**” (emphasis added). The instant specification defines “melodic intervals” at page 7, lines 13-14, as “the pitch interval between a note and a preceding note.” The term “interval” is not defined in the specification, but instead has its ordinary, art-accepted meaning, namely “the distance in pitch between two notes” or the “ratio of frequencies of the two notes” (see music dictionary definitions of interval provided as exhibits A and B filed with Applicants’ response of March 3, 2004).

As discussed in Applicant’s previously filed amendment and response of February 6, 2004, unlike Applicants’ invention, the Ghias et al. reference discloses a method of searching music files using *relative pitch transitions between successive notes* (col. 3, lines 8-20). Each note is given a designation as being the same pitch as the previous note (S), a higher pitch than the previous note (U), or a lower pitch than the previous note (D), thereby converting the melody

of the song into a sequence of letters using S, U, and D. Inputs are converted into this sequence of pitch changes or pitch transitions, and the songs stored in the database (in the pitch transition format) are preprocessed and converted into the same format (column 5; line 66). Once the pitch has been determined or approximated, the sequence of relative pitch transitions is compared with corresponding sequences of pitch transitions in the database.

The Examiner asserts that Applicants asserted dictionary definition is encompassed by the teaching of Ghias et al. that “a melody is inputted into a computer...representations of relative pitch differences between successive notes.” Applicants submit that there is a fundamental difference between determining a relative pitch difference (that is, whether a pitch difference exists between successive notes) and determining the melodic interval; i.e., determining what the difference in pitch actually is. Said differently, Ghias et al. teaches determining whether there is a difference between successive pitches, and the present claims relate to determining what the difference is. It is clear, therefore that the instant claims are distinct over the teachings of Ghias et al.

Nevertheless, without acquiescing to the Examiner’s rejection, and solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 7, 21, 22, and 25 herein to further distinguish over Ghias et al. Claims 1, 6, 7, 21, 22, and 25 have been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 5 (now cancelled) that the input means further include “quantization means to determine a closest chromatic interval, a closest whole tone interval, or a closest minor third interval between two successive musical pitches in the sequence of melodic intervals.” Again, all Ghias et al. teach is for a given tone, determining whether the previous tone was a lower, higher, or the same pitch, and does not teach determining what the difference in pitch is. As amended, the instant claims, distinguish further still over Ghias et al. by requiring a determination of a closest chromatic interval, closest whole tone interval, or a closest minor third interval between successive pitches in the sequence of melodic intervals.

Applicants therefore submit that Ghias et al. do not teach each element of the claimed invention and do not anticipate the claimed invention. Applicants accordingly request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 26, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Ghias et al. in view of Zimmerman (U.S. Patent No. 5,563,358). Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Ghias et al. in view of Lybrook et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,731,847). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Ghias et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Ghias et al. and Zimmerman

The Examiner asserts that Ghias et al. do not teach determining a chromatic interval, but that "Zimmerman et al. disclose teaching or training means, wherein said input means further includes quantization means to determine a closest chromatic interval, a closest whole tone interval, or a closest minor or major third interval between two successive musical pitches . . . it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art . . . to utilize the teachings of Zimmerman with the apparatus of Ghias et al. because Zimmerman et al. provide the teachings of using a chromatic interval as part of comparing and pitch matching techniques which provides more information for providing a match in melodies or tunes."

Zimmerman is directed to using a chromatic interval for comparing and matching pitch as part of the musical instruction of a student. The chromatic interval being calculated is relative to the pitch of the tonic, the first note of the scale (Col. 9, Line 13). Zimmerman et al. does not teach or suggest "an apparatus for searching a database of music files, comprising input means to provide search criteria comprising a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals," as required by claims 5-7 of the instant application.

For the reasons described below, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings (*In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)).

Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest *all the claim limitations*. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974).

Applicants submit that even if the Ghias et al. reference is combined with the Zimmerman et al. reference, the two disclosures do not provide the invention as claimed in claims 5-7. That is, the recited combination lacks essential elements of the claimed invention.

The recited combination of references does not disclose "an apparatus for searching a database of music files, comprising input means to provide search criteria comprising a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals," nor does it disclose "an apparatus for searching a database of music files, comprising input means to provide search criteria comprising a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals."

Claim 5

While claim 5 is no longer pending, thus rendering this rejection moot as to that claim, Applicants provide the following remarks with respect to the subject matter of claim 5 which as been incorporated into the independent claims of the invention.

Zimmerman does not teach "*quantization means for determining a closest chromatic interval, a closest whole tone interval, or a closest minor or major third interval between two successive musical pitches*".

Zimmerman, in contrast, is directed to a completely different function than the present invention. Zimmerman teaches a music training system in which the purpose of the device is to indicate how closely to a target *monophonic reference source* a student is managing to play or sing a note. For each note in a sequence of notes, the student endeavors to perform with a note that matches the note played by the training system. The note played by the training system is the *monophonic reference source* (see column 5, lines 31 and 32). The student tries to perform matching to this reference.

The interval determination provided by the training system of Zimmerman ('SHOW INTERVALS' function) is solely for the purpose of visually displaying an interval relative to the *monophonic reference source* as the tonic (column 9, lines 52 to 58). If no pitch is present in the monophonic reference channel when the 'SHOW INTERVALS' button is pressed, then the previously stored tonic (monotonic reference source) is used. Thus, there is no teaching whatsoever of "quantization means for determining a closest chromatic interval, a closest whole tone interval, or a closest minor or major third interval between two successive musical pitches in the sequence of melodic intervals" as claimed in revised claim 5.

The passage referred to by the Examiner (column 9, lines 1 to 28) appears merely to specify how an interval may be calculated. The second passage of Zimmerman referred to by the Examiner (column 16, line 44 *et seq*) refers to the functions performed by the waveform analyser 56 (Figures 2 and 5, see column 15, line 63) or by the waveform analyser 65 (Figure 2) which is described as being identical to the waveform analyser 56 (see column 11, lines 37 and 38).

The analyser 56 processes the monophonic reference channel 55 (Figure 2) while the analyser 65 processes the student sample channel from pre-amp 64 (Figure 2). The identified passage merely specifies that the waveform being analysed in either channel may be converted/allocated to the nearest semitone in the conventional Western scale of approximately 100 semitones. There is no discussion of any purpose for this activity; it seems most likely that its purpose is to allow display of the reference waveform and/or student sample waveform as a note on a conventional musical stave. There is, again, no suggestion of "quantization means for determining a closest chromatic interval, a closest whole tone interval or a closest minor or major third interval between two successive musical pitches in the sequence of melodic intervals" as claimed in claim 5.

Thus, Ghias et al. and Zimmerman do not, either alone or together, teach each element of the claimed invention. Applicants therefore request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 6

It will be equally apparent that, since there is no discussion in Zimmerman of any comparison of successive musical pitches in a sequence, the document does not teach or suggest “*quantization means for determining a closest major, minor or other scale to which successive musical pitches of the sequence of melodic intervals will fit*”, as claimed in claim 6.

The various functions of the quantization means of the present invention, in processing the sequence of melodic intervals of the input search criteria significantly improve the subsequent matching capability of the comparing means, as discussed in the specification in the sections entitled “*Quantization of audio input*” and “*Note discretization*”.

Applicants have reviewed the passages cited by the Examiner which allegedly provide the limitation recited in claim 6 and can find no teaching of quantization means for determining a closest major, minor or other scale to which successive musical pitches of the sequence of melodic intervals will fit. To the extent that the Examiner maintains this rejection, Applicants request that the Examiner indicate the specific teachings of Zimmerman which provide such quantization means.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that when combined, Ghias et al. and Zimmerman do not teach each element of the invention recited in claim 6, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 7

There is likewise no teaching in Zimmerman of means to determine, from the sequence of melodic intervals, a succession of rhythmic intervals and to use this succession of rhythmic intervals as further search criteria. The Examiner cites passages in Zimmerman that allegedly provide this teaching but, as noted above, Applicants have reviewed these passages and can find no teaching of determining a succession of rhythmic intervals which are used as search criteria. Accordingly, the teachings of Zimmerman combined with Ghias et al. do not teach each element of claim 7.

In the event that the Examiner maintains this rejection of claim 7, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out the specific teachings of Zimmerman which provide means for determining a succession of rhythmic intervals and the use of the succession of rhythmic intervals as search criteria.

Lack of Motivation

To reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103, in addition to teaching all the elements of the claimed invention, the combination of references must be suggested, either implicitly or explicitly, by the references themselves; one of skill in the art must find motivation in one or more of the references to combine the teachings therein. Applicants submit that no such motivation is found in either Ghias et al. or Zimmerman. Unlike cases in which motivation to combine reference is established where the reference teachings are directed to solving the same problem (See, e.g., *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 357 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2004)), the references cited against the instant claims relate to two completely unrelated technologies. Ghias et al. relates to a method for digitizing a melody to be searched against a melody database. Zimmerman teaches a musical training apparatus which provides feedback to a student as to whether the notes they are playing or singing are the same as a reference note. Zimmerman does not teach or even suggest utilizing the input provided by the student to search a melody database. Likewise, Ghias et al. does not teach or suggest that the searching method taught therein would be adaptable as a training aid. One of skill in the art, given the teachings provided by each of Ghias et al. and Zimmerman would not have been motivated to combine the teachings therein to produce the claimed invention. Moreover, even if combined (as described above), the references do not teach each element of the claimed invention.

Ghias et al. and Lybrook et al.

The Examiner has rejected claim 8 as being obvious over the combination of Ghias et al. and Lybrook et al. The Examiner states that “Lybrook et al. disclose an apparatus, including means...to provide as input additional search criteria comprising text information...it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art ...to utilize the teachings [of] Lybrook et al.

with the teachings of Ghias et al., because the teachings allow for an alternative input, wherein text can be used as an input to the system.” Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Unlike the present invention, the Lybrook reference discloses a synthesizer to simulate a song based on the input of the user. The allophone rules 103 in Fig. 1 are used in combination with the text input of text material 101 to generate a sequence of allophones (Col. 3, Line 41) to generate sound. Even if combined with the teachings of Ghias et al., the combination would not teach each element of the claimed invention. Lybrook et al. and Ghias et al., taken alone or together, fail to teach does not teach or suggest “an apparatus for searching a database of music files, comprising input means to provide search criteria comprising a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals, wherein the input means includes quantization means to determine a closest chromatic interval, a closest whole tone interval, or a closest minor or major third interval between two successive musical pitches in the sequence of melodic intervals” as required by claim 8 of the instant application.

Thus, because the teachings of Ghias et al. and Lybrook, even if combined, do not provide all the limitations of the claimed invention, claim 8 is not obvious over the combination. Applicants therefore request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Ghias et al.

The Examiner has rejected claims 26 and 27 as being obvious over Ghias et al. The Examiner asserts that although Ghias et al. does not teach means for designating the gradient of each element as one of the categories selected from the group consisting of horizontal/near horizontal; diagonal; and vertical/non-vertical; and means for coalescing adjacent elements of the same category to form compound elements, these aspects were well known in the art and thus, it would have been obvious to use the well known teachings in the art with the apparatus of Ghias et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

At the outset, Applicants note that the Examiner has made an assertion that the teachings of gradients and means for coalescing adjacent elements are well known in the art, but has not provided and support for this statement. Regardless, however, even if the Ghias et al. reference

is combined with what is known in the art regarding the use of gradient and related components for determining points or comparison of an input signal over a period of time, the recited combination does not disclose, "an apparatus for searching a database of music files, comprising input means to provide search criteria comprising a tune as a sequence of melodic intervals, wherein the input means includes quantization means to determine a closest chromatic interval, a closest whole tone interval, or a closest minor or major third interval between two successive musical pitches in the sequence of melodic intervals."

Therefore, because the combination of Ghias et al. and the well known teachings in the art does not provide each element of the claimed invention, the instant claims are not obvious over this combination.

Applicants submit that in view of the foregoing remarks, all issues relevant to patentability raised in the Office Action have been addressed. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of rejections over the claims of the present invention.

Date:

1/16/04

Respectfully submitted,



Name: Kathleen M. Williams

Registration No.: 34,380

Customer No.: 29933

Palmer & Dodge LLP

111 Huntington Avenue

Boston, MA 02199-7613

Tel.: (617) 239-0100



Atty. Docket No.: 5538/2012

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Finn, et al.
Serial No.: 10/072,176
Filed: February 7, 2002
Entitled: Music Database Searching

Examiner: Fletcher, M.T.
Group Art Unit: 2837
Conf. No.: 1323

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8a

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any paper or fee referred to as being enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Post Office as First Class Mail on the date indicated below in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Nancy Arsenault

Name of Person Mailing Paper

Signature of Person Mailing Paper

Mail Stop RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Enclosed for filing the above-identified patent application, please find the following documents:

1. Request for Continued Examination (RCE) Transmittal;
2. Copy of Amendment After Final Rejection under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 as filed on 11/16/04;
3. Petition for two (2) month Extension of Time; and
4. Return Post Card.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any fees to Deposit Account No. 16-0085, Reference 5538/2012. A duplicate of this transmittal letter is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/9/05

Matthew Beaudet
Registration No.: 50,649
Customer No.: 29933
Palmer & Dodge LLP
111 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02199-7613
Tel: 617-239-0100